

October 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 13167

of piecemeal as the appropriations requests trickle in. The budget should also be broken down by programs so that it would be easier to spot the oft-occurring duplication of efforts among the multitude of agencies.

There are many other changes that are long overdue. As noted in these columns recently, the accounting practices of several agencies are sadly deficient, even by Federal standards. Perhaps, as the CED has proposed, the General Accounting Office should run regular audits of all the agencies.

Neither Mr. Mills nor anyone else is under any illusion that the Federal budget can be brought firmly under control overnight; there are, for one thing, too many political pressures for retaining the status quo. But he clearly sees that temporary spending cuts offer the economy no better sanctuary than a spot in the eye of a hurricane.

If the Administration doesn't get that idea, too, it will have missed the whole point of Mr. Mills' protest and set the stage for further financial deterioration.

IMPORTED MEAT LABELING

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. STEIGER of Arizona) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, during recent years we have seen a great deal of controversy and substantial economic loss to beef producers throughout the country because of an excess volume of imported meat and meat food products from foreign countries. There has also been much concern expressed with regard to truth in labeling in order that the consumer might not in any way be misled because of a lack of, or misleading, label attached to any given product.

It would therefore seem to be in the best interests of both the producer and the consumer that we require that all imported meat and meat food products bear a label showing the country of origin of such imported meat. It has become even more significant of recent date that the Congress respond with legislation that would require imported meat products to be so identified.

On January 16, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld, without explanation, the decision of the Oregon district court which had held that State's meat labeling law was unconstitutional. This, of course, has the effect of nullifying many such labeling requirements which have been enacted by respective State legislatures.

It is obvious that the livestock industry and American agriculture have recognized and demanded that such requirements be enacted. The fact that many State legislatures have written into State law labeling requirements for imported meat is indicative of adverse market effects and resulting depressed prices having given sufficient cause for State legislative action in enforcing more protection.

Congress should take prompt action to restore the protection and validate the purpose for which 19 States wrote these labeling laws originally.

I have, therefore, joined my colleagues in introducing legislation which is designed to accomplish that purpose. I hope both Houses of the Congress will respond with favor to them.

FUNDING OF THE HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM

(Mr. COLLIER (at the request of Mr. STEIGER of Arizona) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, since the Congress and the administration are faced with dealing with the critical problem of the current budget deficit, there is certainly one bill which can be killed this year that will save \$85 million. I refer to the funding of the highway beautification program. Not only will defeat of this spending bill contribute to reducing the budget deficit, but it will likewise save a host of administrative headaches at both the State and Federal level.

The ultimate cost of the program will be between \$2 and \$3 billion by the administration's own estimates, but I predict that it will run substantially higher than that figure in a matter of a comparatively short time.

Confusion with regard to implementation by the States as provided in the original bill is evidenced by the fact that 45 of the 50 States have not yet been able to reach any agreement with the Federal Highway Administrator with regard to advertising control.

LIMITING CATEGORIES OF 1970 CENSUS QUESTIONS

(Mr. WATSON (at the request of Mr. STEIGER of Arizona) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years the Federal Government has increasingly become involved in the insidious business of privacy invasion. Evidence of this is clearly seen in the mounting attacks by our colleagues in the House and Senate upon the Government's gathering of data of a highly personal nature.

We hear a great deal these days about civil rights, and yet, often forgotten are individual rights. Especially overlooked in recent years has been an individual's right to enjoy privacy without fear of snooping by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, it has been held in cases to numerous to mention that the right of individual privacy is sacred under the law. The fourth amendment to the Constitution guarantees our right to privacy, and the Supreme Court has not deviated in its judicial interpretation of that amendment. Historically, the Court has not encountered privacy cases in which a complex interpretation of the fourth amendment was needed since in most instances the issue was cut and dry.

But, the advent of modern scientific and technological achievements in the 20th. century have rendered judicial interpretation of the fourth amendment in a broad new light. As is so often the case, scientific achievement in many areas has failed to parallel man's understanding of its advances. For instance, most Americans were amazed to learn just a few years ago that electronic listening de-

vices could be used to monitor private conversations. However, electronic "bugging" was only the beginning of a whole new world of privacy invasion. It has now become an accepted fact that no man is an island as far as many bureaucrats in Government service are concerned. Although unknown to most Americans, some Federal agencies have at their disposal more statistical data on an individual than he knows about himself.

Yes; with pharisaical indignation some Americans are always ready to cry that their civil liberties are being violated while, at the same time, there are few cries about the direct and sinister methods of curtailing individual freedom currently being advanced with the full knowledge of the Federal Government.

Of course one of the most dangerous methods of privacy invasion concerns the increased use of tests for civil service employees. As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, various tests are necessary to determine eligibility for Federal employment, but I am unalterably opposed to personal tests which require an individual to answer questions wholly unrelated to the nature of his employment. The effort of many of these tests is, nothing more than a bureaucratic form of employee harassment and an encroachment upon the employees' lives. There are healthy signs that Congress under the able leadership of our distinguished colleague in the Senate, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], will enact a bill of rights for civil service employees. I have joined many of my colleagues in sponsoring this legislation which is so sorely needed.

Mr. Speaker, another indication that Congress is becoming more aware of Federal snooping occurred just recently when House and Senate committees failed to approve plans by the administration to create a national data bank. Although receiving very little fanfare, the establishment of a national data center with its interchangeable counterpart, a personal dossier bank, would contain fantastic amounts of information about every citizen of this country. During the hearings on this matter, testimony clearly indicated that such a statistical center could, if placed in the wrong hands, result in an effective snooping device on American citizens.

But, the end of the snooping business is far from over. Now, a far-reaching and dangerous method of privacy invasion is being advanced by the Bureau of the Census in its 1970 census forms. After reading a test questionnaire recently mailed by the Census Bureau to 25 percent of the households in New Haven, Conn., I am convinced that this Federal agency's thirst for information completely outstrips its need for it. While I am not advocating that the American people ignore the 1970 census, I am suggesting that many of the questions posed on the New Haven sample forms constitute an invasion of privacy. It is, indeed, ironic that the Census Bureau was also a prime mover in the national data bank scheme.

H 13168

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 10, 1967

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS], in a forthright and courageous manner, has called this census questionnaire to the attention of the House. In my opinion it should be carefully reviewed by every Member of this body. In the final analysis I think that most of us would agree the census form is unnecessary, but more important that it is an invasion of privacy. Under existing law, penalties for noncompliance in answering census questions ranges up to 60 days in prison and a fine of \$100. It is unconscionable to compel citizens of this country to answer a host of ambiguous and highly personal questions under penalty of law.

Today I am joining my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS], in introducing legislation to limit the categories of information to be answered on the census questionnaire. Certainly, legislation of this type is needed to restrict the Census Bureau, or any other Federal agency, from tampering with the private lives of our citizens.

INSURANCE COMPANY CONCEDES NECESSITY FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

(Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. STEIGER of Arizona) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed interested to learn that one of America's largest insurance companies has publicly conceded the necessity for a comprehensive congressional investigation of automobile liability insurance. In a statement of policy appearing in Philadelphia newspapers on Monday, October 10, and signed by the board chairman, the company frankly admitted:

For the past several years it has become clear that the present automobile insurance system in America is not working to the satisfaction of anyone: neither the consumer, the insurance companies, nor the state and federal governments.

In calling for action by legislators, the policy statement asserts:

What happened was that the law and auto insurance stood still, while the auto itself and its place in American life changed radically . . . What is needed is an entirely new approach to the problem presented by the victims of auto accidents. . . .

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this policy declaration will appear in most of the Nation's newspapers and periodicals during the next several weeks. As one who has long been concerned with the social problems presented by the automobile and automobile liability insurance, I have previously expressed the dissatisfaction of policyholders, lawyers, judges, doctors, claims adjusters, independent sales agents, and body repair shop operators with the present system of insurance. This latest declaration by a representative of a major company in the insurance industry should eliminate any lingering doubt that an in-depth congressional investigation of automobile liability insurance is long overdue.

THE "THIN" LINE OF ABM'S

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. STEIGER of Arizona) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, after years of insisting that an anti-missile-missile system was both unnecessary and undesirable, the President has now found that our country's defense requirements dictate that at least its partial deployment can no longer be postponed. In making this quick reversal of policy Secretary McNamara announced that the go ahead had been given for a "thin" line of antiballistic missiles—ABM's—costing some \$5 billion to protect against possible attack from Red China. In view of Peking's apparently rapid development of a nuclear and missile capability coupled with the unpredictable and belingerent attitude of the Mao regime, such a defense system is clearly, although regrettably, warranted. However, McNamara's assurance that this "thin" system would not protect, and is not meant to protect, against attack from the Soviet Union only underscores the concern of many over what may be a growing gap in our defenses. To date there has been no effective response by the administration to the challenge put forth by the Kremlin by deploying an ABM system of its own many months ago. Because the effort to seek a diplomatic agreement has apparently met with no success, the situation demands the closest scrutiny. We cannot look the other way indefinitely. Just hoping the problem will go away, for to do so risks an open invitation to miscalculation.

A recent editorial appearing in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., of Wednesday, September 20, makes some cogent observations about the administration's ABM decision and I insert it at this point in the Record:

A PARTIAL VICTORY FOR ABM SUPPORTERS

After years of debate, the Johnson administration has reached a decision which fortunately represents at least a partial victory for those who have long urged deployment of an anti-missile defense against nuclear attack.

Announcement that the government has finally decided to build a limited \$5 billion anti-missile system was made Monday by Secretary of Defense McNamara in a speech described by administration officials as one of the most important statements on U.S. strategic thinking since the start of the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

McNamara said the "thin" line of antiballistic missiles (ABMs) is designed to thwart a Red Chinese attack, protect against any accidental firing of Soviet offensive missiles and to render less vulnerable this country's force of 1,000 Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs).

The defense secretary said construction of the new defense system would begin late this year. Other sources in Washington said it would take five to six years to complete.

By that time in the mid-1970s, Communist China is expected to have a modest ICBM force capable of hitting the United States, according to McNamara.

Because of a possibility that Peking might be able to achieve this capability earlier, it would have been better if the administration had not waited so long to decide on the course it disclosed Monday.

McNamara said a nuclear attack by Red China would be insane and suicidal, but "one can conceive conditions under which China might miscalculate and we wish to reduce such possibilities to a minimum."

The secretary said there is no plan for such an anti-missile system buildup against Russia—one that might cost \$40 billion—because it is not believed that the Soviet Union, is seriously trying to develop a first strike nuclear capability against this country. It is fervently hoped that his guess as to Russia's intentions proves to be correct.

Monday's announcement recalls a prod administered in June, 1967, by House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford Jr., of Grand Rapids, who then urged the administration "to get off dead center and get going" on an ABM system.

He said the almost unanimous opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and congressional committees was in favor of proceeding with some form of ABM development.

Taking note of Communist China's first hydrogen bomb explosion earlier in the same month in 1967, Ford commented that "the possession of even one Red Chinese nuclear weapon that can be carried in one conventional bomber radically alters the balance of power in East Asia and the Western Pacific areas . . ."

J. William Fulbright, D-Ark., chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the decision announced Monday represented "a very serious failure of diplomacy."

Throughout recorded history it has been demonstrated again and again that diplomacy in behalf of peace cannot be relied upon. If it could, no country would need military defenses.

Because of failures of diplomacy, the United States has no safe alternative to striving to provide and maintain adequate defenses and, in the terminology of bygone years, to "keep its powder dry."

CAPT. EDWARD J. BURKE, JR.

(Mr. McDADE (at the request of Mr. STEIGER of Arizona) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it is an undoubted fact of life that the most significant thing in the life of America today is its commitment in Vietnam. We read or we hear daily literally thousands of words on that war, in an ever-widening debate about the wisdom of our commitment or the desirability of bringing the conflict to an early termination. Unfortunately, in an enthusiasm for such debate, we do not often enough look at the men who are fighting in this terrible war, and who are performing acts of bravery and heroism daily.

I would call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to the attention of all my colleagues here in the Congress, the recent award of the Air Medal to a distinguished officer in the U.S. Army who is presently serving in Vietnam.

He is Capt. Edward J. Burke, Jr.

Captain Burke is one of those brave men who flies over enemy territory in support of our counter-insurgency efforts in Vietnam. These are the men who become the eyes of the army. They face constant danger on these flights; but because they face this danger, the men who fight below them in the jungles have a far better chance of coming home safe to their families.